DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 260 JC 850 129

AUTHOR Petersen, Allan; Cepeda, Rita
TITLE English as a Second Language: Statement of Findings and Policy Recommendations.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 46p.; Discussed as Agenda Item 3 at a Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, April 18-19, 1985). For a related document, see ED 239 673.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Curriculum; Community Colleges; Educational Legislation; Educational Policy; *English (Second Language); Language Tests; Policy Formation; Program Development; *Second Language Instruction; *Statewide Planning; Student Placement; Teacher Education; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

Designed to provide information and guidelines for the formation of policy on English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction in the California community colleges, this report to the Board of Governors offers policy recommendations and reports on the findings of a survey of community college ESL offerings. Section I provides background information, discusses the sources of legislative authority for the provision of ESL instruction, and underscores the need for Board action in light of demographic trends and projections. Section II describes the methods used to gather information upon which to base the policy construct for ESL. After section III defines ESL in terms of its sociological setting and purposes, section IV offers eight recommendations for future policy covering areas such as course classification, criteria for credit/noncredit offerings, ESL assessment practices, course content equivalencies, program articulation, data collection, and ESL instructor training programs. Finally, section V presents findings from the field survey, on course offerings; student assessment, identification, and placement practices; funding sources; support services; and staffing patterns. Appendices include information on ESL tests and testing; criteria for placement in beginning, intermediate, and advanced ESL; a rationale for the transferability of community college ESL courses to four-year colleges; guidelines for desirable competencies for ESL teachers; and detailed survey findings. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED255260

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
April 18-19, 1985

Item 3

Title: English as a Second Language: Statement of Findings and Policy Recommendations

Staff Presentation: Allan Petersen, Administrator
Rita Cepeda, Specialist
Program Evaluation and Approval

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 850 129

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
April 18-19, 1985

Item 3

Title: English as a Second Language: Statement of Findings and Policy Recommendations

Staff Presentation: Allan Petersen, Administrator
Rita Cepeda, Specialist
Program Evaluation and Approval

Summary

English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) offerings, both credit and noncredit, have grown significantly over the past twenty years. With an enrollment of 114,000 students during the 1983/84 academic year, ESL was probably second only to the English composition course requirement in numbers of enrollments for all entering freshmen. However, despite its significance as an instructional area, ESL is still subject to much misunderstanding by administrators, faculty and policymakers in particular.

Perceptions about the academic worth, scope and function of ESL range widely. At one end of the spectrum, there are ESL practitioners who argue that ESL carries with it all the academic rigor involved in learning a foreign language. A second group argues that ESL is purely a remedial undertaking while yet a third do not perceive ESL as a legitimate college-level offering. What is clear is that ESL is an extremely complex instructional area. Its pedagogy, practical application and social implications are significantly intertwined and as such its definition has been difficult to articulate. For all these reasons, it is clear that there is great need for the establishment of guidelines that can assist in understanding ESL as an instructional offering and can help administrators and policymakers make sound educational decisions about its future.

This information item reports on the background leading to the development of this document; establishes the need for Board action based on demographic growth; describes the methodology of the work process; presents a set of recommendations with their accompanying rationale and reports on the findings of a field survey. The proposed recommendations are of central importance to this report because they will form the basis for a framework for future ESL policy which will be subsequently submitted to the Board for action. A brief synthesis of these recommendations is included below:

Issue: ESL is currently offered under at least nine different departments and classified under five separate TOP Codes.

Recommendation #1: Establish a uniform TOP Code classification for all ESL course offerings.

Issue:	Given the recent mandates to develop stricter criteria for credit and noncredit offerings confusion over the appropriate designation for ESL exists.
Recommendation #2:	Complement Title 5 criteria for credit/noncredit offerings with additional operational criteria to help in the differentiation between credit and noncredit ESL.
Issue:	Of the 89 colleges which offer ESL, 57 offer ESL only for credit because in these areas of the state noncredit offerings are the sole purview of the K-12 districts.
Recommendation #3:	Provide alternative options for colleges with credit-only programs to enable them to serve all students.
Issue:	As many as 21 different assessment instruments are used statewide, therefore, placement decisions vary from college to college leading to problems concerning student transfers from college to college.
Recommendation #4:	Establish an ESL assessment committee to review correlation studies of various language assessment tests, thereby facilitating more uniform ESL assessment practices statewide.
Issue:	There are no uniform criteria for the various levels of ESL course offerings as such there are problems related to ESL-level equivalencies from college to college.
Recommendation #5:	Facilitate course content equivalencies for the beginning, intermediate and advanced ESL levels through statewide guidelines.
Issue:	The University of California and California State University also offer ESL. Intersegmental articulation concerns have arisen particularly in regards to the ESL levels which are the equivalent of English Composition.
Recommendation #6:	Designate a special committee to study issues related to the articulation of ESL programs and courses with four-year colleges and adult schools.
Issue:	Due to the reporting and classification problems with ESL, existing reporting vehicles are not being utilized consistently for ESL and a dearth of information exists.
Recommendation #7:	Ensure that ESL data is gathered and reported annually by adapting existing reporting mechanisms; and

Issue: Because of their shared refugee or immigration experience, socio-economic status, cultural and academic backgrounds, ESL students require that their instructors possess specific skills unique to their language learning needs.

Recommendation #8: Establish an ESL instructor competency training program and study the implications of establishing a separate ESL Instructors' credential.

Action on this item is proposed for the May 30-30 meeting of the Board of Governors.

I. Background

On January 27, 1984, an information item was presented to the Board of Governors entitled "English As A Second Language: Its Scope, Role and Definition Within California Community Colleges." This item was prepared in response to previous Board actions related to language minority issues and in partial response to "Promises to Keep," a report produced by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). The CPEC report focused on remediation and addressed a number of related issues, including English as a Second Language. While acknowledging that ESL did not fit entirely within the definition of remedial course offerings, Commission staff nevertheless identified ESL as an area with significant implications for the future.

"Promises to Keep" recommended that all segments of postsecondary education examine, no later than January 15, 1984,

> "the clientele, provision of services, and potential growth of English as a Second Language services as a preliminary step in the development of a coherent philosophy and practical strategy to meet both current and future need."

The January 1984 Board item on ESL was intended to do several things:

a) define CPEC's interest in ESL;

b) differentiate between ESL course offerings and remedial course offerings;

c) chronicle community college efforts in the area of ESL policy, instructional and legislative arena;

d) document the necessity for policy development using demographics as a key factor.

Two of the items above (c and d) have been restated below with some minor expansions. This has been done because a discussion of previous legislative authority and pertinent demographic indicators is a factor which is central to the rest of this document.

Legislative Authority

The legislative authority for the provision of ESL instruction is provided in both Federal and State law. The most pertinent piece of Federal legislation is the Vocational Education Act (P.L. 98-524), also known as the Carl D. Perkins Act. Federal law requires that vocational instruction be made accessible to all persons with, emphasis on those with greatest need. Within the latest reauthorization of the Act, language minority background persons are given priority for services. As such, ESL and Vocational ESL (VESL), in particular, is clearly supported and mandated by Federal law.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State mandates are numerous but the most pertinent pieces of legislation include:

- AB 459 (Chapter 915, Statutes of 1977 - Montoya)--established the first distinct authority in the Education Code differentiating credit from non-credit courses, thereby allowing for the classification and state support of courses including ESL which did not directly apply to the AA degree.

- SB 154 (Chapter 292, Statutes of 1978 - Rodda)--Further confirmed the difference between credit and non-credit and for the first time set forth in the Education Code language which authorized state support for:

  > "...courses in elementary and secondary basic skills, a class in English for foreigners, a course in citizenship, a course in a trade or industrial subject, including apprenticeship classes as they are defined by the Chancellor's Office, a special course for handicapped adults."

- AB 8 (Chapter 282, Statutes of 1979 - Greene)--was the major funding measure for 1979-80 and 1980-81. This bill required, among other things, that the Chancellor's Office conduct a study of credit/non-credit offerings and that it recommend specific criteria for classifying these courses. In addition, AB 8 added sections 8530-8531 to the Education Code, which requires the establishment of mutual agreements of responsibility regarding non-credit classes and programs to be offered by either the community college or the adult school.

- AB 1626 (Chapter 103, Statutes of 1981 - Hughes)--added section 84641 to the Education Code. This established nine specific noncredit courses eligible for state funding. English as a Second Language was identified as one of the distinct areas to receive state support.

Demographic Projections

One of the first problems identified by staff in the development of this document was the lack of direct measures to identify the English language proficiency needs of community college students. As a result, it became necessary to resort to secondary or indirect measures of need. Some of the sources examined included a) 1980 Census Data; b) Refugee enrollment in community colleges; c) State Department of Finance demographic projections; and d) Community College Student Profiles/Ethnic Census Data.

All demographic sources examined projected the rapid growth of language minorities and the accompanying need for English language instruction. Most pertinent to this report are the estimates provided on the number of limited-English proficient (LEP) adults in California for 1984. Based on the most recent report of the California State Department of Education (DATA/BICAL Report #84-2), in 1984 there were 487,835 limited-English proficient children in California public schools. It is estimated that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for every two to three LEP children, there is one LEP adult. Given this ratio, California may have anywhere from 160,000 to 245,000 LEP adults in need of ESL instruction.

The student refugee population has also grown significantly. A 1982 Chancellor's Office report on the impact of Indochinese refugees in California Community Colleges indicated that the total refugee student enrollment for Fall 1982 was 41,448. While this constituted only three percent of the total student enrollment for that year, this enrollment was up 41.6% over the previous year. The most recent information about refugee immigration provided by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) also supports projected increases in refugee student enrollment. According to ORR California continues to attract between 30 and 35% of all refugees entering the United States. During the 1985 fiscal year, 10,827 refugees entered the United States and 3,575 of those settled in California.

The cultural growth of ethnic and language minority populations and their impact on California Community Colleges was further documented in our own Planning and Future Study report (Board of Governors, November 1984). This study indicates that by the year 2000 there will be at least six million new Californians who will comprise the nation's most diverse population by age, ethnicity and lifestyles. Furthermore, this study points out that this demographic trend will result in an increase of LEP adults enrolling in community colleges.

II. Methodology

Following the presentation of the first ESL item and its subsequent endorsement by the Board, staff identified two basic sources for the development of a policy construct for ESL. The first source was the direct input from a representative panel of experts and practitioners; the second was a field survey designed to gather data not available through existing reports.

Chancellor's Task Force on ESL

The Chancellor's Task Force on ESL was formed and met six times, beginning in June 1984 and ending in January 1985. Members of the task force included three practitioners and three other representatives, one each from the chief executive officers, chief instructional officers and Academic Senate, respectively (See Appendix A for a list of Task Force members).

At the initial meeting of the task force, staff outlined a number of expectations and goals based on a number of background sources including: a review of publications from: the English Liaison Committee of the Articulation Conference of California, and English Council of Two-Year Colleges; meetings with the Community College Consortium of English as a Second Language, the California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, the Northern California Learning Assessment and Retention Consortium, and the California Association of Community Colleges' Commission on Instruction; and the 1984 annual conference of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chief Instructional Officers. A non-prioritized listing of key ESL policy issues emerged as follows:

- o Development of a definitional statement of philosophy for ESL
- o Establishment of a unique classification for ESL courses and programs under the Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) codes
- o Definition of Credit and Non-credit ESL
- o Student Assessment and placement criteria for beginning, intermediate and advanced ESL
- o Intersegmental course articulation
- o Determination of the ongoing data and informational needs for the field.

Based on the review of these issues, it was agreed that the work of the Task Force would focus on three areas: 1) development of a definition of English As A Second Language; 2) development of a set of policy recommendations for Board action designed to provide a set of guidelines for the appropriate growth of ESL in community colleges and 3) formulation of an ESL field survey.

III. Defining English As A Second Language

It has long been recognized by ESL practitioners and other professionals involved in the teaching of language and language learning theory that one of the greatest problems faced by ESL as an instructional area is the inability of others to understand the scope, application and place of English as a Second Language instruction within the community colleges' curriculum. This confusion of ideology, while in part due to lack of constant and uniform terminology, is also related to varying beliefs regarding the mission and functions of community colleges themselves.

The CPEC report is an example of the level of misunderstanding concerning ESL. CPEC's inclusion of ESL within a study of remedial education, despite the caveats offered, represents a general tendency among educators to view ESL as a remedial subject.

There have been many studies concerning second language acquisition, learning theory, and cultural adaptation which have direct bearing on the formulation of a philosophical and educational definition for ESL language instruction. All these studies recognize that the acquisition of a foreign or second language, in a setting other than in the natural process which takes place without formal institutional intervention, requires academic rigor and an educational process which is anything but remedial or compensatory in nature.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Sociological Setting

Despite the understanding that learning a foreign language is an academically rigorous undertaking, another factor entered into the task force deliberations; namely, the socio-economic and socio-political characteristics of ESL students. It became clear that assessment of academic proficiencies was not sufficient to determine placement. Other factors unique to this population had to be considered including:

a. previous educational level

b. literacy in the student's own language

c. recency of the immigration experience

d. immigration status -- refugee, permanent resident, student visa, etc.

e. economic status -- many of these students are at poverty level and have little or no resources

f. employment status -- the problem here is not just unemployment but employment training, skills transfer and language ability

g. health status -- both physical and mental. Some ESL students have undergone the refugee experience, coupled with other traumas including cultural shock.

It is clear, therefore, that while ESL as an academic area should not be categorized as remedial, ESL as an instructional continuum needs to be adapted to the needs of the students served. It is important to note that this adaptative approach is already used in other disciplines and is in fact advocated by proponents of individualized instruction. Nevertheless, in an attempt to reach consensus and define ESL within a philosophical and instructional context, task force members agreed on the following operational definition of ESL:

> *English as a Second Language (ESL) refers to the teaching of English to persons whose primary language is not English. ESL is taught within an adaptive continuum and student placement is determined according to student academic skill and/or educational goal.*

Given these criteria, ESL may be said to serve two basic purposes:

1. Enabling - ESL instruction here is tailored to meet individualized educational goals. English for Special Purposes (ESP) is a good example of enabling ESL. Instruction here may be geared to help students succeed in a community college Freshman English class, to achieve a certificate in a vocational field, to prepare a student for immediate entry into the workplace, and to learn survival skills in a new country.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Developmental - The instruction provided here is designed to reinforce previous ESL instruction.

IV. Policy Issues: Recommendations for Future Policy

As previously stated in this item, Chancellor's Office staff set about to identify key policy areas of concern central to the current and future provision of ESL instruction in community colleges.

The following set of eight policy recommendations are based upon the combined information received from several sources of input, including the Chancellor's Task Force on ESL, results from the field survey and meetings with community college faculty and staff involved in the ESL instructional area. Each recommendation is followed by a rationale which offers the justification for the recommendation.

Recommendation #1 - Uniform TOP Classification

It is recommended that the current Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) code for ESL programs be expanded in order to accommodate the necessary variations of the ESL continuum. In addition, it is also recommended that ESL courses, regardless of the department from which they are offered or the curriculum structures of the colleges, should always be coded under one TOP code, namely the 4930.80 and its sub-categories as follows:

4930.80 ESL General
4930.81 ESL Composition
4930.82 ESL Reading
4930.83 ESL Conversation
4930.84 ESL Listening
4930.84 ESL Computational
4930.85 ESL Tutorial
4930.86 ESL Pronunciation
4930.87 ESL Vocabulary
4930.88 Vocational ESL (VESL)

The proposed uniform ESL classification guidelines are necessary because in the past, English as a Second Language programs, while assigned to a specific TOP Code (4930.80) have been reported under various other codes, such as:

1501 English/interdisciplinary
1501.01 Comparative Literature
1199 Language Miscellaneous
4499 Tutorial, and
4930.70 Reading Vocabulary

This problem has contributed to the present inability to produce accurate reports on ESL and a consequent problem concerning projections and accurate data for future policy planning.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Because TOP is central to other reporting vehicles such as the Course Classification File and the Course Activities Measure (CAM), ESL data included in this report--credit/noncredit status of a program, the specific course identifier number, course title, transfer status, vocational education classification and measures of attendance provided by Average Daily Attendance (ADA), positive attendance (PA) and Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH)--are often not available or unreliable at best.

Recommendation #2 - Criteria for Credit and Noncredit ESL

Recommendation 2a: It is recommended that ESL be subject to the same criteria for differentiating between a credit and noncredit course as described in existing Title 5 Sections 55002.

Recommendation 2b: It is recommended that in addition to Title 5, at least one of the following criteria should also be considered by districts determine whether an ESL course should be offered for credit: a) the establishment of a specific placement score as a prequisite to a credit course, or b) the designation of a particular course as having an academic or transfer focus.

It is clear that ESL, like any other course offering in community colleges, must first meet the established criteria for credit and noncredit courses as mandated in Title 5, Section 55002. These criteria are central to college administration and determine the courses' eligibility for state apportionment. This section of Title 5 also charges college officials with the responsibility for determining course content and for applying appropriate academic rigor, thereby establishing a course as credit or noncredit. It is in this specification of appropriate academic rigor where most disagreement exists. For this reason, additional criteria are offered as guidelines to supplement Title 5. At least one of the following guidelines may be used in conjunction with Title 5, to determine whether a particular ESL course should be offered as credit or noncredit:

1. Cut off placement scores -- establishment of a cut off score on a variety of ESL tests that can be used by districts for placement. For example, placement in a beginning credit ESL course could be based on the following raw scores:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*TESTS:	IOI	60-74	
	EPT G/H	15-18	(with 38 + on EPT A/B)
	STEL I	30-37	(with 38 + on STEL B)
	ELSA IC	13-16	(with 20 + on BC/BN)
	IN	14-17	
	CELT-STRUCTURE	30-35	
	LCPT	25-29	
	SLEP	28-31	(First 35 items)
	CELT-LISTENING	20-24	

While these assessment instruments may test different linguistic skills, all the above scores relate to the same language proficiency level. A corresponding score on any similar standardized test could also be utilized for the same purpose.

2. Course focus -- could be the second criteria utilized by districts in determining credit or noncredit ESL courses. For example, FSL classes with an academic focus (classes that teach academic skills needed for college and university work) would be assigned to the credit column, whereas ESL classes with a survival life skills focus would be assigned to the noncredit side.

Classification of credit or noncredit ESL should be determined through the use of the criteria mentioned above. For example, an evaluative guide for determining whether a course should be offered for credit or noncredit could look as follows:

---

* A complete bibliography of ESL test and correlated test scores are included in Appendix B. When interpreting test scores for placement or promotion purposes, it is also essential that oral/aural assessment of each student be considered. When using the EPT, STEL, and ELSA tests, it is necessary to administer the Beginning test to all students. If the student scores 38 or more on EPT and STEL or 20 or more on ELSA, the Intermediate test is then given and interpreted as above.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NONCREDIT	CREDIT
A course should be designated noncredit if:	A course should be designated as Credit if:
1. It complies with Title 5 regulations for a noncredit course - and meets at least one or more of the following criteria:	1. It complies with Title 5 regulations for a credit course and if at least one or more of the following criteria are met:
2. Accepts students whose scores on a designated ESL Placement test are below the level established for beginning Credit ESL Courses	2. Accepts students whose scores on a designated ESL placement tests are on or above level established for beginning Credit ESL courses
or;	or;
3. The content of the course focuses on Survival Skills	3. The content of the course is to prepare students for academic skills development:
or;	or;
4. The goal of the course is to prepare students for pre-vocational skills training.	4. The ESL course is the equivalent of Freshman English;
or;	or;
5. The course is a Vocational ESL (VESL) offered concurrently with a noncredit vocational education course.	5. The course is a Vocational ESL (VESL) course offered concurrently with a credit vocational education course.

Recommendation #3 - Colleges With Credit-Only Programs

It is recommended that alternative options be provided for colleges with "credit-only" programs by designating those ESL courses which do not meet the proposed criteria as: (1) Credit courses which do not apply to the associate degree and which are offered for "workload credit"; or (2) Courses which are offered on a Credit/No Credit basis.

On January 25, 1985, a progress report of the Chancellor's Task Force on Academic Quality was brought before the Board. This report presented a "Proposal for Strengthening the Associate Degree." One of the basic tenets of this proposal is that stricter criteria must be applied to all credit offerings and, as such, only some current offerings should apply toward fulfillment of the unit requirements for the Associate degree. Credit courses which do not not meet these stricter criteria should be offered either as noncredit or as "Credit Courses Which do Not Apply to the Associate Degree."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Of the ninety-eight colleges responding to the ESL survey, 82 colleges had credit offerings. Of these, 57 colleges offered ESL only under the credit program and as such do not have the option to classify any offerings under the noncredit mode. A review of this significant fact prompted staff to study the applicability of the credit/noncredit differentiation guidelines in the event that some of the courses presently offered by credit-only programs should have difficulty meeting the proposed criteria.

Whether or not a college opts to maintain the "workload credit" or Credit/No Credit approach for some ESL offerings, or whether these colleges adopt the "Not Degree Applicable" proposal, the important issue is that students continue to be served. The options discussed in this section maintain access while supporting the concept of academic quality.

Recommendation #4 - Uniform Student Assessment Policies

It is recommended that an assessment committee be formed to study all assessment and placement instruments used in ESL programs and to facilitate the implementation of more uniform assessment practices through the review of test correlation studies.

Recommendation #5 - Placement Criteria for Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced ESL

It is recommended that statewide criteria be established to facilitate course content equivalency for Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced ESL and that these criteria be based on the guidelines provided by the nine-level continuum included in this document.

One of the ESL issue areas most in need of definition and clarification is the area concerning uniform assessment and consequent placement criteria. Based on advanced research work performed by the San Francisco Community College Centers Mainstream English Language Training (MELT) Project, Task Force members agreed on the formulation of operational criteria based on a nine level continuum to determine placement for Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced ESL. In order to better understand the terms Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced, in relation to ESL levels, these terms might be equated to the following level designators:

Beginning ESL would correspond with Levels 0 to III
Intermediate ESL would correspond with Levels IV to VI
Advanced ESL would correspond with Levels VII to IX

It should be understood that these levels do not equate to any given number of courses nor do they imply any time period equivalency (e.g. semesters, years, quarters, etc.). These levels are simply offered as benchmarks or groupings which are differentiated from each other based on a set of expected competencies per level. In addition, Task Force members concurred with the usefulness of these placement levels as criteria for determining credit and noncredit ESL. Furthermore, it was recommended that the middle intermediate level (ie. level V) could be the cut-off level between credit and noncredit ESL.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Level descriptors, a bibliography of commonly used ESL assessments tests, and a table with correlated tests scores is provided in Appendix C of this document.

Recommendation #6 - Intersegmental Course Articulation

It is recommended that the Chancellor's Office, in conjunction with the Articulation Council of California, designate a special liaison subcommittee to study issues related to the articulation of English as a Second Language programs and courses with four-year colleges and adult schools.

The CPEC report clearly indicated that ESL course offerings were prevalent at all segments of postsecondary education. The study further documented the rapid growth of such courses during the period between 1978 and 1981 for each of the three public segments of postsecondary education as follows:*

University of California	62.1% increase
California State University	86.8% increase
Community Colleges	77.5% increase

Given these figures, it is apparent that the number of community college ESL students that will transfer to four-year colleges will also increase. It is imperative, therefore, that course equivalencies and articulation agreements be clearly developed. For example, whether an ESL course is granted general education credit, elective credit or major requirement credit should be determined on whether the student is enrolled in an academic, vocational or undeclared field. Appendix D of this document includes some helpful considerations which may be taken into account during the course articulation process. The information provided is a rationale for the transferability of community college ESL courses offered for credit under either the academic or vocational education area.

Recommendation #7 - Ongoing Data Needs

In order to facilitate future policy and curricular decisions on English As A Second Language (ESL), it is recommended that the Chancellor's Office adapt existing reporting mechanisms to ensure that key data on ESL are provided on an annual basis.

As a result of the field survey conducted in preparation for this item, a number of data factors were identified as being useful to the future ESL related practices. Following is a listing which constitutes the optimum information needs for ESL. Those items that have been starred represent the minimum requirements and those which can be provided with the least amount of effort from existing reports:

* Source: CPEC Promises to Keep pp. 44, 66 and 89, January 1983.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Information Needed		Proposed Reporting Tool
a.	Language Census Data	Student Census Data File
*b.	Course Aggregate Totals	Course Classification File
	- Course Identifier	Course Classification File
	- Course Title	Course Classification File
*c.	Number of Credit ESL	Course Classification File
*d.	Number of Noncredit ESL	Course Classification File
e.	Number of Transferable ESL	Course Classification File
*f.	Number of Vocational ESL	Course Classification File
g.	ESL Course Offering by subdiscipline area	TOP Inventory
*h.	ADA Generated by ESL	CAM Report
i.	ESL Budget related costs	
j.	Number of ESL community college graduates	
k.	ESL Student transfer ratio	
l.	Completion rate of ESL Transfers	

Recommendation #8 - Staffing Requirements/Credentialing

It is recommended that the Chancellor's Office implement a statewide ESL instructors inservice training program in cooperation with the appropriate community college faculty and staff. Furthermore, it is recommended that a report be developed to examine the implications of implementing a separate ESL community college instructor's credential.

Teaching English as a Second Language is a profession which is distinct and separate from other language related disciplines. "Although there are elements in their preparation which ESL teachers share with others, the uniqueness of their educational responsibility cannot be overlooked."[1] Instructional competencies for teachers of ESL must include criteria which recognize the fact that teaching English to non-natives requires methods which differ from those used in teaching natives or teaching standard English as a second dialect. Clearly these areas of language instruction share some linguistic and pedagogical elements; they differ, however, both in scope and teacher preparation. The National Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), has outlined its position on desirable competencies for the teacher of ESL and desirable components of a teacher education program that would lead to those competencies (see Appendix E).

Based on the work of TESOL, the California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) developed a proposed training sequence to address ESL teacher competency needs. Whether an

---

[1] TESOL - 1970 Guidelines Conference - "Guidelines for the Certification and Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ESL class is credit or non-credit does not change the fact that ESL teachers must be specially prepared. Thus, the same teacher preparation requirements should apply to credit and non-credit.

A statewide in-service training program may be established as part of the State Chancellor's Office responsibility for staff development. This training will be conducted in a series of workshops in cooperation with the appropriate community college representatives. In addition, the proposed training may evolve into the core criteria requirement for the development of a separate ESL instructors' credential. Following are the training program components:

a. Introduction to the Study of Language

b. Psychological Factors in Language Acquisition

c. Socio-cultural Factors on Language Acquisition

d. Analysis of English for Teaching Purposes

e. Methods of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

f. Testing

g. Materials for Use in Classes for Non-native Speakers

V. Field Survey

The purpose of the ESL survey was twofold. First, the survey was designed to gather data in five basic areas including course offerings; student assessment, identification, and placement practices; funding sources; student support services; and staffing patterns. Second, the sruvey results were used to validate the policy recommendations in the preceding section while serving as a guide for future study. The field survey was completed in January 1985 with a 91% response rate.

The following section is designed to highlight those findings deemed most significant, and to note the implications of the findings. A complete report of all findings is included in Appendix F.

Limitations of the Data

The information which follows is based on the responses provided by 98 colleges. Only 9 colleges failed to respond, but these colleges do not represent large programs and as such the information provided is very representative of the field. Before developing the survey, staff anticipated that many of the colleges would have problems in responding because they had not collected the requested data. Respondents were directed to complete as much of the questionnaire as possible and were encouraged to provide estimates where necessary, so long as these were identified as such. Staff's intent was to gather as much information as possible, hoping that those bits of data which were consistently provided would in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

their aggregate, paint an accurate picture of ESL offerings. Some of the specific limitations of the data resulted from:

- Incomplete Surveys - Several colleges left questions unanswered or indicated that those data were not available.

- Inconsistency of responses - Some colleges provided their answers in percentages, while others provided actual numbers. Staff converted this information into actual numbers based on other known factors.

- Multiplicity of Responses - In areas where options were provided for "fill-in" responses, the number and variety of responses submitted forced their condensation into similar categories

- Estimations - Several respondents provided estimates in the absence of actual figures.

Following are a highlights of the survey findings which create a composite description of ESL as an area of instruction.

Highlight of Survey Findings

A. Extent of Course and Program Offerings

- o 98 colleges responded to the survey. Of these, nine colleges offer no ESL. Of the remaining 89 colleges, 57 offer only credit ESL, seven offer only noncredit ESL and 25 offer both credit and noncredit ESL.

- o Approximately 85% of all ESL courses are offered under the English and ESL instructional areas.

- o The two departments under which ESL is most often found are English and Language Arts. There are eight other departmental designations which were reported for ESL, but these constituted a small percent of the total.

- o Approximately 51 of the 89 colleges which offer ESL also offer some form of ESL for special purposes. Most of these are offered in the vocational education areas. The top six areas, in order of priority, include: (1) Auto Technology, (2) Business, (3) Education Electronics, (4) Health Occupations, (5) Vocational Education (generic), (6) Computer Science, and (7) Industrial Technology.

B. Student Assessment Identification and Placement Practices

- o The number one means of identifying ESL students is identification by the student him/herself. In descending order of frequency, the next five approaches include: (1) departmental

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

referral, (2) college-wide testing, (3) placement testing, (4) admissions, and (5) counselor referral.

- There were as many as 21 different ESL assessment instruments utilized for placement by the colleges. However, more than 55% of the colleges used four basic tests. In order of frequency, these are: (1) A writing sample/essay, (2) the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, (3) The English as a Second Language Placement Test (EPT), and (4) The Structure Test of the English Language.

- The number one criterion used to advance an ESL student into the English 1A (Freshman English) course is the completion of the prescribed sequence of ESL courses established by that college.

- The total enrollment of ESL students (both credit and noncredit) as reported by 89 colleges is 113,688.* Of these, 67% are enrolled in noncredit ESL courses, while 33% are enrolled in credit ESL. The age breakdown of students indicate that in the credit area 46% of the students are between the ages of 18-25, while 37% of the students in the noncredit area are in this same age range. In general, credit students are younger than noncredit students. For example, 25% of noncredit students are over 40 in contrast to 9% of the credit students who are in this range.

- In terms of previous academic preparation, there are differences between credit and noncredit students. Only 12% of credit students had a 6th grade or below educational level in comparison with 33% for noncredit. Thiry-seven percent (37%) of the credit students had some college preparation, compared with 7% in the noncredit area.

- Fifty four percent of all students are female, while 46% are male.

- The ethnic composition of ESL students, while greatly diverse--with as many as 29 ethnic groups reported--is nevertheless made up primarily by three groups which comprise 87% of the total: Hispanics (47%), Southeast Asians (20%) and Chinese (20%).

C. Course Activity Measures/Fiscal and Instructional Support Sources

- The major source of support for ESL course offerings is ADA.

---

* This figure is a duplicate count of enrollment because one student may enroll in one or more courses. It does represent an actual measure of course activity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- During the 1983/84 academic year, there were approximately 2,201 sections of credit ESL offered and 3,217 noncredit sections. The student enrollment for these sections was 37,020 and 76,668, respectively.

- While ADA figures could not be accurately ascertained because of problems with the data reported, an estimate may be based on sections offered and student enrollment. Based on these two measures, the low estimates for credit and noncredit respectively are: 11,423 and 23,657. The high estimates for credit and noncredit are: 15,231 and 31,543.

- The direct instructor costs (i.e., salaries) both part-time and full-time, credit and noncredit, as reported by 78 colleges is approximately $18 million, with an average of $232,000 per college reporting.

- Credit and noncredit instructors' costs are $6,799,772 and $11,275,657, respectively.

- ESL programs are staffed primarily with part-time faculty. Sixty-nine percent (69%) of all ESL instructors are part-time. Only 15% are full-time instructors teaching ESL full-time, while another 16% are full-time instructors teaching ESL as only part of their full load.

- Support services available to credit and noncredit ESL students vary significantly. Credit students are twice as likely to receive support services than noncredit students. The top four services provided for these students are counseling, use of the learning centers, tutoring and the language lab.

- Noncredit students use support services less than credit students. However, of those services utilized counseling headed the list, followed by language labs, media centers, learning centers, and tutors.

While there were no real surprises as a result of the statewide survey conducted on ESL, those observations and assumptions previously made by ESL practitioners were confirmed. There were some interesting findings differentiating the credit from the noncredit program but most important of all, the survey confirmed that sound decisions, both pedagogically and administratively, are being made by the colleges. For example, younger and better academically prepared students were found in greater proportion in the credit areas while older and less prepared students were primarily in the noncredit areas and were more likely to be enrolled concurrently in vocational education. The noncredit student was primarily interested in the rapid acquisition of skills and in employability, while credit students were preparing to transfer to four-year colleges. A general observation, but perhaps the most telling of all, is that ESL parallels other areas of instruction. Its students, while culturally and linguistically different, have the same concerns and needs, and the male/female ratio and the age breakdown of ESL students are much like those of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the general population. Given the limitations provided, the survey findings, while not qualifying as a hard set of data, do represent the first ever and most representative set of facts about the current ESL educational program in the California Community Colleges.

There is one final caveat regarding the implications for use of the information and guidelines provided. This information, while seeking to describe ESL and define its various facets, does not seek to discount the importance of local control and their ability to respond to local needs. Furthermore, the material presented should only be treated as baseline information from which additional and extended work should follow.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

Chancellor's Office Task Force on English As A Second Language

Saaed Ali
Advisor, Adult Basic Education
Glendale Community College
1500 North Verdugo Road
Glendale, CA 91208

Jane Armstrong*
Dean of Instruction
Fullerton College
321 East Chapman Avenue
Fullerton, CA 92634

Peggy Doherty
ESL Resource Instructor
San Francisco Community College Centers
Teachers Resource Center
31 Gough Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dr. Maurice Law Costello
Instructor, English/ESL
San Jose City College
2100 Moorpark Avenue
San Jose, CA 95128

Robert Rockwell
Dean of Academic Services
Mt. San Jacinto College
21-400 Highway 79
San Jacinto, CA 92383

Sharon Seymour
English As A Second Language Center
College of Marin
Kentfield, CA 94904

*Designee for Dr. Philip Borst, President, Fullerton College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

TEST BIBLIOGRAPHY

CELT L, S — A Comprehensive English Language Test for Speakers of English as a Second Language. David P. Harris and Leslie A. Palmer 1971. McGraw-Hill.

ELSA BC/BN IC/IN AN/AL — English Language Skills Assessment: Beginning Conversation; Beginning Narrative; Intermediate Conversation; Intermediate Narrative; Advanced Narrative; Advanced Letter. Donna Ilyin, Cecelia Doherty, Lauri Fried Lee, and Lynn Levy. Newbury House. 1981.

EPT A/B G/H — English Second Language Placement Tests for Adults, Forms A, B, G, H. Donna Ilyin, Jan Best, and Virginia Biagi. San Francisco Community College District. 1971.

IOI — Ilyin Oral Interview. Donna Ilyin. Newbury House. 1976.

LCPT — Listening Comprehension Picture Test. Donna Ilyin. Newbury House. 1980.

SLEP — Secondary Level English Proficiency Test. Educational Testing Service. 1982.

STEL — Structure Tests-English Language. Donna Ilyin and Jan Best. Newbury House. 1976.

MTELP — Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency. University of Michigan, English Language Institute. 1964.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EQUIVALENCY SCORES OF STUDENTS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SEMESTER
ON VARIOUS ADULT ESL TESTS

Part I. Reading - Grammar Tests - Raw Scores

LEVEL	STEL	ELSA	CELT - Structure
50	B (1 & 2) 0-7	BC/BN 0-8	
100	B (1 & 2) 8-19	BC 9-13 BN 9-12	
200	B (1 & 2) 20-29	BC 14-17 BN 13-16	
300	B (1 & 2) 30-37 or B (1 & 2) over 37 and I (1 & 2) 0-29	BC 18-19 over 19 Take I BN 17-19 over 19 Take I IC 9-12 IN 9-13	
400	B (1 & 2) over 37 and I (1 & 2) 30-37	BC/BN over 19 and IC 13-16 IN 14-17	30-35
500	I (1 & 2) over 37 and A (1 & 2) 0-19	IC 17-19 IN 18-19 over 19 Take A AN/AL 12-14	36-42
600	I (1 & 2) over 37 and A (1 & 2) 20-40	IC/IN over 19 AN/AL 15-17	42-48

San Francisco Community College
Centers Division, MELT Project
June 1984

EQUIVALENCY SCORES OF STUDENTS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SEMESTER
ON VARIOUS ADULT ESL TESTS

Part II. Listening Comprehension Tests - Raw Scores

LEVEL	LCPT	SLEP	CELT - Listening
50	1 - 4		
100	5 - 9		
200	10 - 17		
300	18 - 24	20 - 27 (based on first 45 items)	
400	25 - 29	28 - 31 (based on first 45 items)	20-24
500	30 - 33 (400+)	32 - 42 (based on all 75 items)	26-28
600		43 - 51 (based on all 75 items)	30-34

San Francisco Community College
Centers Division, MELT Project
June 1984

APPENDIX C
LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Criteria for Placement in Beginning ESL

LEVEL 0 No ability whatsoever in any of the linguistic skill areas.

TESTS: Unable to take a paper/pencil test.

LEVEL I Unable to function in spoken or written English. Able to understand some isolated words and phrases if supported by visual cues. May be able to name colors, read letters of the alphabet, and dollars and cents, and write own name and address with assistance.

TESTS: Probably will be unable to take paper/pencil test but may want to try and may guess and make a few points.

IOI	0-10
EPT A/B	0-10
STEL B	0-7
ELSA BC/BN	0-8

LEVEL II Able to understand a restricted range of simple previously learned phrases spoken slowly and with some repetitions. Able to read and write some words and phrases and produce basic personal information simplified forms. Weak telephone ability; prefers not to speak on the telephone.

TESTS:

IOI	11-24
EPT A/B	11-19
STEL B	8-19
ELSA BC	9-13
BN	9-12
LCPT	5-9

LEVEL III Able to understand previously learned phrases and simple new phrases which contain familiar vocabulary. Able to function in most basic survival situations. Able to ask and respond to direct questions on familiar subjects. Can engage in conversation and participate with difficulty in some social situations when the content is familiar and when addressed directly. Little control of grammar. Can read simple sentences and instructions and simplified materials on subjects related to immediate needs. Able, but with difficulty, to write short sentences to convey instructions and simple messages.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TESTS:	IOI	25-29
	EPT A/B	19-27
	STEL B	20-29
	ELSA BC	14-17
	BN	13-16
	LCPT	10-17

Criteria for Placement in Intermediate ESL

LEVEL IV Able to understand conversation on a variety of everyday subjects with some need for repetition. Can give simple explanations and ask for clarification. Can communicate on the phone but with difficulty. Control of basic grammar is evident but inconsistent. Able to read simplified materials on subjects within Able to read simplified materials on subjects within a familiar context with some comprehension of non-simplified materials. Able to perform most daily writing tasks with some errors in a familiar context including short personal notes and letters, but with some degree of difficulty.

TESTS:	IOI	40-59
	EPT A/B	30-37
	G/H	0-14 (and 38+ on A/B)
	STEL B	30-37
	I	0-29 (and 38+ on B)
	ELSA BC	18-19
	BN	17-19
	IC	1-12 (with 20+ on BC/BN)
	IN	1-13 (with 20+ on BC/BN)
	LCPT	18-24
	SLEP	20-27 (First 45 items)

LEVEL V Able to understand conversation on a variety of everyday topics with decreasing need for repetition. Able to expand on basic ideas in order to keep a conversation going. Control of basic grammar is becoming more consistent. Able to read simple narrative and informative material and to identify implied information in reading. Has limited ability to organize a narrative or descriptive paragraph.

TESTS:	IOI	60-74
	EPT G/H	15-19 (and 38+ on EPT A/B)
	STEL I	30-37 (and 38+ on STEL B)
	ELSA IC	13-16 (and 20+ on BC/BN)
	IN	14-17 (and 20+ on BC/BN)
	CELT-STRUCTURE	24-33
	LCPT	25-29
	SLEP	28-31 (First 45 items)
	CEET-LISTENING	17-22

LEVEL VI Able to understand conversations between native speakers when speech is not too rapid. Able to initiate and sustain conversations on everyday topics. Able to understand most lectures on familiar subjects at normal speed. Telephone ability somewhat limited. Reads and understands lesson materials at an intermediate level including narrative and descriptive tests. Uses all-English dictionary with some reference to bilingual dictionary. Able to write business letters and fill out complex applications with some degree of accuracy. Limited ability to organize a narrative or descriptive paragraph.

TESTS:		
	IOI	75-100
	EPT G/H	20-29 (and 38+ on EPT A/B)
	STEL A	0-19 (and 38+ on STEL I)
	ELSA IC	17-19
	IN	18-19
	AN/AL	12-14 (with 20+ on ELSA IC/IN)
	CELT-STRUCTURE	33-39
	SLEP	32-42 (75 items)
	CELT-LISTENING	23-27

Criteria for Placement in Advanced ESL

LEVEL VII Able to understand most conversation on non-technical subjects when addressed directly. Makes some errors in idiom and structure, often obscuring meaning. Cannot always follow rapid conversation between native speakers. Able to communicate by phone on familiar subjects. Has control of basic grammar but not of more difficult grammar. Reads and understands most expository materials with use of English dictionary and material in appropriate academic areas with some use of bilingual dictionary, all at a slow pace. Comprehension problems caused by insufficient vocabulary and difficulty in extracting salient elements. Able to handle routine writing tasks fairly within a familiar context. Sentence structure is under fair control within familiar academic areas; control weakens under time or test pressures. Little understanding of paragraph organization of expository or argumentative essay.

TESTS:		
	EPT G/H	28-40 (and 38+ on A/B)
	STEL A	20-40 (and 38+ on I)
	ELSA AN/AL	15-17 (and 20+ on IC/IN)
	CELT-STRUCTURE	40-48
	MTELP	54-64
	SLEP	43-51 (75 items)
	CELT-LISTENING	28-34

LEVEL VIII Able to understand most conversations on non-technical subjects and routine conversations. Can function when not in face-to-face contact but may have difficulty with rapid speech. Participates effectively in social and academic conversations; makes occasional

errors in idiom and structure, seldom obscuring meaning. Reads and understands general expository materials and texts in academic area with frequent use of English dictionary. Reads with some ease for information and pleasure. Writes with some fluence, but with occasional errors and misuse of idiom. Shows very little understanding of organization of expository/argumentative essay, but is ready to develop and self correct.

TESTS:		
	ELSA AN/AL	18-21 (and 20+ on IC/IN)
	CELT-STRUCTURE	49-58
	MTELP	65-73
	SLEP	51-60 (75 items)
	CELT-LISTENING	35-40

LEVEL IX Able to understand most speech in any moderately clear context. Occasionally confused by highly colloquial or regional speech. Conveys exact meaning. Reads and understands general academic material; displays ability to extract salient elements, sometimes with use of dictionary, at somewhat below native speed. Writes with occasional errors in idiom at somewhat below native speed; demonstrates good control of organization of expository/argumentative essay.

TESTS:		
	ELSA AN/AL	22+ (and 20+ on IC/IN)
	CELT-STRUCTURE	59+
	MTELP	74+
	SLEP	61+
	CELT-LIST	41+

APPENDIX D

RATIONALE FOR THE TRANSFERABILITY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE ESL COURES TO FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Academic Considerations

A report of the English Liaison Committee of the Articulation Conference of California, entitled "Expectations and Evaluations of the Second Language Student: Matters of Articulaton in California Education," proposes that a common set of criteria for determining whether or not students are ready for Freshman Composition is needed and offers suggested guidelines to be considered in evaluating the student's vocabulary, word morphology and syntax and rhetoric. This report points out that there are certain criteria which would per[illegible] and unnecessarily discriminate against students for whom English is a second language. These criteria include language acquisition problems which only "time, interaction and input will alleviate." Appropriate use of articles is cited as one such criterion.

The report does not advocate a separate standard -- one for ESL students and one for mother-tongue students. Instead, the report proposes the use of a common metric which focuses on those competencies expected of Freshman English resulting in the ability to "write generally well-formed sentences and to put these sentences together into a workable text." The evaluative approach supported by the report is one which focuses on "rhetorical and communicative matters, such as persuasion, coherence and argumentation." Task Force members concurred with the model presented in this report and recommended that this approach to evaluation of ESL students be integrated in the proposed community college matriculation plans.

Vocational Considerations

There are both credit-bearing and noncredit-bearing vocational programs in the community college system (for example, the credit Aviation Mechanics program at San Francisco City College and the noncredit Auto Mechanics program at the S.F. Community College Centers. A study similar to the one done by the English Liaison Committee needs to be done to determine articulation policy for these programs. Educators involved in both credit and noncredit vocational programs should be involved. One of the existing criteria already in place could prove useful for consideration, namely that defined by the Student Accountability Model (SAM) as applied for the reporting requirement under the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS).

SAM has established four designations to help determine whether a course is occupational and the progressional or sequencing level for that particular vocational course. The SAM definitions are provided below.

Designation "A" - Apprenticeship

The course is designed for an indentured apprentice and must have the approval of a joint apprenticeship council. Some examples of apprenticeship courses are: Carpentry, Plumbing and Machine Tool.

Designation "B" - Advanced Occupational

Designation "B" courses are those taken by students in the advanced stages of their occupational programs. A "B" course is offered in one specific occupational area only and clearly labels its taker as a major in this area.

Designation "C" - Clearly Occupational

Designation "C" courses will generally be taken by students in the middle stages of their programs and should be of difficulty level sufficient to discourage "drop-ins."

Designation "D" - Possibly Occupational

"D" courses are those taken by students in the beginning stages of their occupational programs. The "D" priority can also be for courses that are exploratory in nature and serve to clarify career choices. These courses may also be used as support or pre-requisite courses in a number of occupational areas.

APPENDIX E

GUIDELINES FOR DESIRABLE COMPETENCIES FOR ESL TEACHERS

The Preparation of the American School Teacher. These guidelines are intended to suggest desirable competencies for the teacher of English to speakers of other languages. In common with that of all teachers, his preparation will be based on a sound *general education* -- courses and experiences which help him become a well-educated person with a strong background in the liberal arts and sciences, including psychology. *Academic specialization* courses and experiences help him to become proficient in the area of concentration; and *professional education* courses and experiences help him prepare himself as a teacher.

The statement which follows presupposes concurrent or prior completion of the baccalaureate degree program and is therefore concerned primarily with academic specialization and professional education. Its purposes are: (A) to define broadly the role of the English-as-a-second-language teacher in American schools, (B) to describe his personal qualities and professional competencies, and (C) to state the minimal objectives for a teacher education program designed to develop professional competencies and to characterize the features of such a program.

A. The Role of the English-as-a-Second Language Teacher in American Schools

The teacher of English to speakers of other languages in American schools is expected to:

1. Progressively develop in his students' comprehension of and ability to interact with English-speaking American society through mastery of communicative competence in English as it is used by the English-speaking population.

   Help his students gain mastery of both receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) English-language skills.

   Help his students gain an awareness of and respect for similarities and differences between the English-speaking culture and their own cultural heritage.

   Help his students gain knowledge of American social customs, traditions, folklore, history and literature in such a way as to contribute to their mastery of the language and culture, and their future educational and social development.

2. Evaluate his students' progress toward the above objectives, identify their strengths and weaknesses in performance, and adjust their instruction appropriately.

3. Make judicious selection and use of approaches, methods, techniques, procedures, materials and aids appropriate to effective language teaching for his pupils and curriculum objectives.

   Evaluate the effectiveness of these teaching procedures and materials in bringing about student behaviors appropriate to the curriculum objectives, and revise their use as necessary.

   Maintain vitality in the instructional program by implementing changes in the goals, procedures and materials whenever such changes are indicated by changes in the teaching situation, or by developments in language-teaching theory and practice.

4. Correlate the sequence and scope of this teaching with that in other instructional areas in the curriculum; and contribute to the definition of curriculum goals for linguistic minority students in English-as-a-second-language specifically, and in other areas generally.

B. Personal Qualities, Professional Competencies and Experience of the English-as-a-Second-Language Teacher in American Schools

To achieve the objectives of his teaching role the teacher of English as a second language in American schools is expected to:

1. Have personal qualities which contribute to his success as a classroom teacher, insure understanding and respect for his students and their cultural setting, and make him a perceptive and involved member of his community.

2. Demonstrate proficiency in spoken and written English at a level commensurate with his role as a language model. Whether he is a native-language or second-language speaker of English, his command of the language should combine qualities of accuracy and fluency; his experience of it should include a wide acquaintance with writings in it.

3. Have had the experience of learning another language and acquiring a knowledge of its structure; and have a conscious perception of another cultural system. If possible, the language and cultural system should be related to that of the population with which he is to work.

4. Understand the nature of the language; the fact of language varieties -- social, regional and functional; the structure and development of the English language systems; and the culture of English-speaking people.

5. Have a knowledge of the process of language acquisition as it concerns first and subsequent language learning and as it varies at different age levels; and understand the effects on language learning of socio-cultural variables in the instructional situation.

6. Have an understanding of the principles of language pedagogy and the demonstrated ability, gained by actual teaching experience, to apply these principles as needed to various classroom situations and instructional materials.

7. Have an understanding of the principles, and ability to apply the techniques and interpret the results of second-language assessment of student progress and proficiency; and ability to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching materials, procedures, and curricula.

8. Have sophisticated understanding of the factors which contribute to the life styles of various peoples, and which determine both their uniqueness and their interrelationships in a pluralistic society.

C. Objectives and Features of a Teacher Education Program in Teaching English as a Second Language

A program to prepare a beginning English-as-a-second-language teacher must provide him with the opportunity to develop the academic and professional competencies set forth in Section B above. These competencies will be developed to a level of proven ability capable of enabling him to fulfill satisfactorily the role-objectives specified in Section A above, and as demonstrated through actual teaching responsibility under experienced supervision.

The program features instruction and experiences which contribute directly to development of competencies in linguistics and English linguistics, psycholinguistics, language pedagogy and assessment, including supervised teaching experience, and studies in culture. In addition, the program requires objective assessment of both the English and foreign-language proficiency of all candidates, and provides or arranges for supplementary instruction whenever necessary.

A teacher education program may be viewed as having five main components with overlapping competency objectives. The list of topics and experiences given here (with cross references to Section B above) is not intended to be exhaustive or limiting, but only broadly suggestive of the content of each instructional component.

1. *Academic specialization.* Courses and training with the primary objective of helping the student to understanding and knowledge of the nature of the language, English-language systems, language learning, and language in culture.

   a. Linguistics and English linguistics (B4) - the nature of the language, its systematic organization, variation and change; major models of linguistic description; major subsystems of present-day English (grammatical, phonological/graphemic and lexical/semantic), its historical development and dialectal variation; contrastive linguistics with special reference to the comparison of English and a "linguistic minority" language.

b. Psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics (B5) - language acquisition processes in first and second language learning, age differentials in language learning, individual learning styles; basic socio-cultural variables in language use and language learning, types of bilingual and multilingual educational situations, social determiners of dialect and style.

c. Culture and society (B3, B4, B5, B8) - the elements of sociocultural systems; cultural pluralism in American society; description, comparison and interrelationship of English-speaking and linguistic-minority cultures; culturally determined life styles and learning styles and their effect on second language learning.

2. *Pedagogy*. Foundations, methods, and practicum - courses and training with the primary objective of providing theoretical and methodological foundations, and practical experience leading to competence in actual teaching situations.

a. Professional education - social foundations and organizations of American education, human growth and development, learning theory, and curriculum development, including the place of English as a second language in the curriculum.

b. Second-language pedagogy (B6) - objectives, theoretical approaches to, and methods of teaching English as a second language; language-teaching techniques and procedures; curricula, teaching materials and aids; adaptation of instructional materials to specific situations; professional information sources: journals, research reports, and professional organizations; design, implementation and evaluation of innovative materials and techniques.

c. Second-language assessment (B7) - principles of testing; techniques and interpretation of second-language assessment of student progress and proficiency; evaluation of teaching materials, procedures, and curricula.

d. Language teaching practicum (B6, B7) - systematic directed observation, supervised teaching practice, and progressive teaching responsibilities which contribute to experience and competence in the primary roles of the English-as-a-second-language teacher described in Section A above. (Although experience gained in the training program will usually be more extensive and direct in the roles that help shape student behaviors (A1-A2) than in those roles more broadly concerned with curriculum development and evaluation (A3-A4), opportunities should be made available for some experience in all roles.)

(1) The institution provides opportunities for systematic, directed observation of a variety of English-as-a-second-language teaching situations for children, adolescents, and adults at beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels

of instruction, and which employ a representative variety of appropriate teaching methods, materials, and aids.

(2) The institution provides directed teaching practice with progressively increasing responsibility, under expert supervision in teaching situations appropriate to the student teacher's employment goals. Through this experience the candidate will both develop and demonstrate his actual and potential ability as an English-as-a-second-language teacher by achieving at least a "good" level of competence in the role-objectives of Section A above.

3. *Another Language, Learning experience, structural and cultural information (B).* For those candidates who have not had recent experience learning another language, the institution offers, or provides by special arrangement, second-language instruction. Whenever possible, courses are available by which the candidate can gain knowledge of the linguistic structure of the language and features of the cultural system of the population with which he intends to work.

4. *Evaluation of candidates.* Evaluation of each candidate's achievement in the areas of competence outlined above is an integral and systematic part of the teacher education program at all its stages (i.e., for admission to, retention in, and completion of the program).

a. English language proficiency (B2) of both native and non-native speakers is demonstrated by satisfactory completion of appropriate college-level course work requiring a high level of oral and written expression and/or objective assessment by standardized test instruments properly interpreted.

b. The institution publishes a clearly formulated policy concerning admission to, retention, and successful completion of the teacher education program. The statement of this policy includes precise information about application procedures and criteria for admission to the program; it indicates how and by what professional criteria students may be eliminated from the program; and it sets forth clearly the minimal academic achievement and level of teaching competence required for successful completion of the program.

c. The institution evaluates the candidate's achievement by instruments appropriate to the measurement of each competency, including direct evaluation of teaching performance. The results of the evaluation are available for advising the candidate in his continuing education and career development, and for recommending, licensing, and employing him. His readiness to teach is certified in the name of the whole institution. An official designated to make such certification is able to demonstrate that he has received assessments concerning the candidate's performance in all units of the teacher education program.

5. *Staff and facilities.* The institution has a staff whose combined competencies are superior to the level of instructional proficiencies which are the objectives of the program. The teachers and supervisors of courses and training in teaching methodology are themselves superior in the competencies outlined in Section B above.

   The institution maintains an up-to-date curriculum materials collection comprising materials, aids, and equipment commonly used in teaching English as a second language at all levels. Journals, research reports, and other sources of supportive professional information are available and kept current.

   The institution maintains close contact with the instructional programs in which candidates serve their observation and directed teaching practice assignments.

Revised by William E. Norris based on criteria adopted by the TESOL Guidelines Conference, May 29-30, 1970 and a preliminary draft by James E. Alatis. Foreword by Albert H. Marckwardt.

These guidelines were distributed to the profession, discussed at the TESOL Convention in Washington in 1972 as well as at other conventions and among the TESOL regional affiliates, and ratified by the Executive Committee of TESOL on March 7, 1975 in Los Angeles.

APPENDIX F

SURVEY FINDINGS

NOTE: The data provided below represents the responses provided by 89 colleges. In most cases, the number responding is large enough to constitute a representative sample. However, while 89 colleges submitted a survey response, not all colleges completed all questions in the survey; as such, the sample size per question varies. In order to present more meaningful data, the number (N=) of respondents per area precedes each information item provided.

A. Course Offerings

1. ESL Course Activity Measures - Number of sections, student enrollment and ADA

a) Of the 98 colleges responding to this survey, only nine reported no ESL offerings on their campuses. Of the remaining colleges, 57 offer only credit ESL; seven offer only noncredit ESL; and 25 offer both credit and noncredit ESL. The course activity reported by these colleges is as follows:

Credit ESL		Noncredit ESL	
# of Sections	Enrollment	# of Sections	Enrollment
2,201	37,020	3,217	76,668

- Total Sections Credit and Noncredit 5,418
- Total Enrollment (duplicated counts)* = 113,688
- Credit Enrollment as a percentage of the total 33%
- Noncredit Enrollment as a percentage of the total 67%

2. ADA generated by ESL course offerings

The data provided by 88 colleges in this area could not be aggregated with any degree of validity. The responses were seldom provided in terms of ADA. Most often WSCH were reported and in other

*Duplicated counts refers to counting a student more than once because he/she may be enrolled in two or more ESL courses during the same period.

instances Positive Attendance (PA) was provided. Because of the inconsistencies in this area, it was decided to provide a high and low ADA estimate based on student enrollment counts reported. This estimate is as follows:

Credit ADA		Noncredit ADA	
High	Low	High	Low
15,231	11,423	31,543	23,657

3. Subject Areas under which ESL is offered. N=89

- English 60%
- ESL 25%
- Speech 9%
- Noncredit Adult Ed 3%
- Basic Skills 3%

4. Departments under which ESL is offered. N=90

- English Dept. 43%
- Language Arts Dept. 21%
- ESL Dept. 10%
- Speech Dept. 9%
- Foreign Languages Dept. 5%
- Drama Dept. 3%
- Bilingual Ed. Dept. 2%
- Adult Ed. Dept. 2%
- Humanities 2%
- Other 3%

5. Number of Colleges Offering Credit ESL. N=89

Of these, the percentage of credit offerings that apply to:

a) General Education is 22%
b) Elective Credit is 57%
c) Major Credit is 4%
d) Freshman English is 9%
e) Other is 8%

6. Colleges which offer ESL for special purposes. Sixty-two colleges responded positively to this question. 95% of all courses in this category were offered under a vocational area as follows:

Auto Technology	19%
Business	18%
Electronics	11%
Health Occupations	10%
Vocational Education	10%
Computer Science	7%
Industrial Technology	7%
Building Maintenance	2%
Home Economics	2%
Upholstery	2%
Engineering	1%
Other	5%

The remaining 5% were offered under Science and mathematics.

B. Student Assessment, Identification and Placement Practices:

7. Method for identifying ESL students. N=86

Self Referral	29%
Department Referral	15%
College-wide Testing	13%
Placement Testing	12%
Admissions	10%
Counselor Referral	8%
Instructor Referral	5%
Country of Origin	4%
Community/Employer Based Referral	3%
School Transcripts	1%

8. a) Placement scores as performance standards utilized for placement of ESL students into the Beginning, Intermediate or Advanced ESL levels. With 68 colleges responding, 21 different placement tests were identified as being used; these have been listed in order of highest frequency of occurrence and the average placement entry/exit score per category is provided.

8. a) (continued)

ESL Placement Tests

Frequency	Name of Test*	Average Range of Scores		
		Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced
9	Writing Sample/Essay	varies per college		
9	Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency	15-50	51-84	63-96
9	English Second Language Placement Test	5-35	36-69	70-75
8	Structure Test - English Language	2-22	23-36	36-48
7	Locally Developed Tests	score varied		
6	TOEFL	375-475	476-525	526+
4	Comprehensive English Language Test	20-28	25-48	55-66
4	San Francisco City College English Placement Test	13-53	41-57	57+
2	BVOPT	none provided		
1	BIAGI	none provided		
1	BEST	none provided		
1	TASK	0-8	8-10	11+
1	ELSA BN /IN	0-12 /0	13-18 /8-11	19-23 /12-19
1	Gibson	none provided		
1	John Oral Test	0-12	13-20	21-35
1	CASAS	Lowest 10%	none provided	
1	LAS	1 and 2	3	4
1	CTBS	none provided		

* Complete test bibliography is included in Appendix D-1.

8. b) Criteria used as prerequisite for entering Freshman English (i.e., English 1A). N=79

- Completion of prescribed sequence of ESL courses 46%
- Instructor recommendation 15%
- Written Sample/Essay 12%
- Structure Test of the English Language (STEL) Score of 50+ 4%
- Completion of ESL course equivalent to English 1A 3%
- A combintation of eight other tests both locally developed and published officially accounted for the remainder 8%

9. Student Profile and Characteristics

a) Age breakdown by percentage of students in both the credit and noncredit program: N=86

Age	Credit	Noncredit
18-25	46%	37%
25-30	23%	15%
30-35	14%	13%
35-40	8%	10%
40 and over	9%	25%

b) Educational background of ESL students as a percentage of total responses in both credit and noncredit: N=85

Educational Level	Credit	Noncredit
6th grade or below	12%	33%
7th to 12th grade	42%	53%
Some college	37%	7%
College degree	9%	7%

e) Breakdown of ESL students by sex: N=82

- 46% of the enrollment is male
- 54% of the enrollment is female

f) Breakdown of ESL students by ethnic background: N=84

Hispanic	47%
Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian)	20%
Chinese	20%
Pacific Islander	3%
Japanese	2%
Korean	2%
Black (Non-Hispanic)	1%
Other (22 ethnic groups representing a fraction of one percent)	2%
Unknown	3%

In summary, language minority breakdown for most ESL students may be said to fall into two major areas:

1. Spanish Speaking 47%

2. Asian Languages 48%

C. Course Funding Sources

10. Number of ESL students enrolled in community service ESL (fee-based programs).

Only 13 indicated that they offered ESL under their community services program.

11. Other support sources for ESL.

Only 13 colleges indicated other sources of funding, as follows:

- five colleges charged Out-Of-State tuition for nonresidents
- four colleges received funds through the State Department of Education/Adult Basic Education (ABE 306)
- two reported utilizing a combination of fees and grant monies
- two colleges received private funds through contracts established with employers.

Based on this information, it may be confirmed that ESL depends primarily on ADA-generated funds for its support in both the credit and noncredit areas.

12. Instructors' cost associated with ESL.

With 78 colleges responding in this area*, 65 on the credit side and 24 in the noncredit area, the direct instructors' costs were reported as follows:

Direct Instructors' Cost

Credit			Noncredit		
N-.66	Total Cost	Average Cost/College	N=.24	Total Cost	Average Cost/College
Part-Time	1,770,436	26,824	Part-Time	6,903,820	287,659
Full-Time	5,029,336	76,202	Full-Time	4,371,837	182,159

*Some colleges offer both credit and noncredit.

D. Student Support Services/Staffing Patterns

13. Access to student support services by both credit and noncredit ESL students: N=71

Support Service	Availability for Credit Students	Availability for Noncredit Students
Counseling	13%	6%
Health Services	9%	2%
Language Labs	11%	5%
Learning Centers	12%	4%
Tutors	11%	4%
Media Centers	9%	5%
Library (Special ESL Section)	6%	3%

It may be surmised from the figures above that credit students are twice as likely to have access to support services than noncredit students. This result is compatible with the findings for the general community college student population. The implications for ESL students, however, are more serious because this student population is more apt to be in need of specialized services.

14. Breakdown of Full-Time and Part-Time ESL faculty: N=78

15% of the ESL instructors have been hired as full-time faculty and are teaching ESL full time

16% of the ESL instructors have been hired full-time but teach ESL only as part of their full-time load

69% of the ESL instructors are part-time faculty

These findings confirm the observations provided by practitioners in the field that ESL is an area which is disproportionately staffed by

part-time faculty. This finding has important implications for ESL as an instructional area, inasmuch as part-time faculty may not have the flexibility or the opportunity to participate in the existing curriculum planning and evaluation activities of the college.

MAY 8 1985

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024